
Community, *Comunidad*, Collectives and Neoliberal Political Decentralization in Peru

Susan Vincent *St. Francis Xavier University*

Abstract: Community building is both derided as the product of neoliberal regionalization and extolled as its alternative. The Peruvian community of Allpachico demonstrates that these two facets are linked. I show how forms of association have adapted to changing economic patterns over the past 100 years. Thus, the *comunidad campesina*, established to support small-scale agriculture, now offers unpaid peasant labour to state projects that both sustain cheap wage rates and produce infrastructure of prime interest to migrants. However, these projects also ensure the ongoing viability of the community, which relies on complex relationships between peasants, pensioners and migrant workers.

Keywords: Peasants, community, Peru, economic practices, state restructuring, neoliberalism

Résumé : La construction communautaire est à la fois tournée en ridicule comme le produit de la régionalisation néolibérale, et portée aux nues en tant que son antidote. La communauté péruvienne d'Allpachico démontre que ces deux facettes sont liées. Je montre comment les formes d'association se sont adaptées à l'évolution des structures économiques au cours des 100 dernières années. Ainsi, la *comunidad campesina*, établie pour soutenir l'agriculture d'échelle locale, offre maintenant du travail paysan non rémunéré à des projets étatiques qui à la fois soutiennent une échelle de bas salaires et produisent des infrastructures très profitables pour les migrants. Néanmoins, ces projets assurent aussi la viabilité continue de la communauté, qui repose sur des relations complexes entre les paysans, les bénéficiaires de pensions et les travailleurs migrants.

Mots-clés : Paysans, communauté, Pérou, pratiques économiques, restructuration de l'État, néolibéralisme

Community, as Amit (2010) has noted, is everywhere. Communitarians (please see Etzioni 1996; Kymlicka 2007) and development commentators and practitioners (please see Bebbington and Perreault 1999; Chambers 1983, 2008; Escobar 1997; Khan 1997; Maclean 2010; Mathie and Cunningham 2008; Parpart, Rai and Staudt 2002; Woolcock and Narayan 2000) have been especially active in assuming and building collective forms of local organization and culture, often in avowed efforts to curb the individualism and global nature of neoliberal processes.¹ In contrast to these authors who see community as the solution to present ills, Cowen and Shenton (1996) understand this passion for organizing local groups as evidence of the ongoing intrusion of capitalist relations into everyday lives. They argue that community destruction and construction are cyclically invoked in the flow and ebb of capitalism. Recent analysts of neoliberal globalization concur with this view, arguing that valorization of the local is integrally related to the process (please see Brenner 2004; Friedman 1999, 2002; Harvey 1995; Jessop 2002; Sassen 2008). Given these contrasting views of community as solution to the devastating effects of capitalism on one side, and as capitalist tool on the other, it is essential to examine community building projects and processes to uncover their intentions and effects. I take up that challenge here to examine a state project to replace existing local collective forms with ones intended to be more conducive to promoting a neoliberal economy, focusing on how the people themselves negotiate with these forms.

The notion of community has a particularly powerful cultural and political significance in Peru where perceptions of pre-Conquest, reciprocity-based social organization have informed social, political and artistic movements along with government policy and development practice for nearly a century. Thus, in response to the *indigenista* movement, the 1920 Constitution legally established the *comunidad indígena* (indigenous community, later

the *comunidad campesina*, or peasant community). The importance of this political structure has waxed and waned for both its members and the state at different moments since its establishment. Other local collectives have been organized alongside the *comunidad* since its inception, sometimes in concert and sometimes in opposition to it. In the years after 1990, however, government and other development agencies alike have dedicated special vigour to promoting alternatives including service user groups, women's groups, youth and the residential (as opposed to the legally defined) community. In particular, over the past decade Peruvian communities have contended with a state project to reorganize local governance, rebuilding the structure of local communities, at the same time as the national economy has burgeoned in a neoliberal wave of foreign investment. These factors have marginalized the venerable *comunidad*. In its place the state has promoted the municipality as the preferred structure of local governance, linked within larger regions as a way of ordering economic development.

Similar conjunctions of downsizing and rescaling of government with the promotion of a competitive market economy have been studied for regions around the world (Allen and Cochrane 2010; Brenner 2004; Jessop 2002; Sassen 2008). Much of the attention has focussed on major global cities or regions that can exploit advantageous geographic locations or resources. Harvey (1989), for example, called attention to "urban entrepreneurialism" that led to uneven economic development between better and less endowed (or assertive) regions. This research tends to focus on jockeying between major regions and cities.

In a case more relevant to my research, Narotzky and Smith (2006) study the Spanish Autonomous Region of Valencia, where the regional character builds from informal production and associated labour practices. Their "historical realist" approach, which I apply below, focuses on three dimensions (Narotzky and Smith 2006: 4-6). The first relates to the form of reproduction of the political economy—the material and political arrangements that structure broad capitalist reproduction and the fitting of local livelihoods into this. The second concerns the "instituted social practices" (Narotzky and Smith 2006:5) of the people as they work in and around the political economy. These practices derive from the relations and conflicts that constitute the making and consolidation of classes. The third draws on Raymond Williams' idea of "structures of feeling" (1973, cited in Narotzky and Smith 2006:4) to focus on how people understand their lives and the conditions under which they unfold. The histories of processes and people are critical in this model

as these provide the resources on which both individuals and the state (and supra state polities) draw, at the same time as they structure possibilities. Further, Narotzky and Smith observe the configuration of place in both local and policy imaginaries in the context of the new neoliberal regionalism. Thus, policy grooms specific interpretations of local characteristics to create a case for certain types of capitalist activity. These local characteristics themselves are the product of the people's past experiences, and are dynamically transformed through their struggles under the new conditions.

Here I use this framework, with its three dimensions in historical and place-based context, to analyse the structural politics and local struggles around different iterations of community in the small Peruvian highland peasant community I call Allpachico.² Allpachico is a legally recognized *comunidad campesina*. I begin with the broad political and economic context by outlining the history of state constitution of the local community in Peru leading up to the current political restructuring program. This program reorders policy and legislation respecting municipalities and peasant communities in a way intended to encourage local creative engagement with the capitalist economy. I then turn to the people, in Narotzky's and Smith's second dimension, to describe four historical periods that follow the development of the different class-like groups in Allpachico, intersecting this with concurrent transformations in *comunidad*/community formation. This presentation shows that labour has been the major export of the community in a region with unevenly distributed production possibilities of interest to large-scale capitalism. Hence, the factions that have developed derive from how households relate to wage earning, whether they include a wage earner, receive a pension, or are in a reciprocal alliance with one of these. In consequence, although it is a very small community, Allpachico's economy is diverse, including subsistence agriculture, wage income, informal sector work, pensions and remittances from both temporary and permanent migrants. While there are struggles among these groups over who has what kinds of rights to community membership, these are overlaid by ongoing mutual dependence. The third section focuses on a conflict at a recent fiesta to highlight the corresponding meanings of community for the different groups of Allpachiqueños. In turn, this leads back to government restructuring, as Allpachiqueños negotiate with the policy and each other to maintain community and livelihood.

The analysis shows that the *comunidad* has been the central node in relations among Allpachiqueños as well as with external agencies. Recent projects sponsored by the

latter, including those now available through municipal participatory budgeting, have provided residential services attractive to migrants, while relying in unacknowledged ways on the non-migrant farmer members of the *comunidad*. The type of projects undertaken arguably underwrite the reproduction of a cheap local work force for the poorly paid jobs that are still available in the region or elsewhere in Peru. Thus, local collective action and resources appear to support a proletariat and the reorientation of the economy to neoliberal goals.³ However, the evidence also shows how different groups work with and around the state's attack on the *comunidad* as it attempts to elicit more capital-friendly and capital-generating collective forms, to build their own lifeways and meet their livelihood needs.

Community, Comunidad and Political Restructuring in Peru

To set the stage for this discussion of the complex struggles over place, meaning and livelihood, I begin with a brief history of the structural relationship between locality and the state in Peru. During much of the 20th century, the Peruvian state has looked to the *comunidad campesina* as the structural conduit to the indigenous highland peasantry. Indigenous communities had been formally abolished in 1824 when Peru achieved independence from Spain, although in practical terms they continued to exist to meet the needs of their residents as well as various requirements of the state (Thurner 1995). The reinstatement of the *comunidad indígena* in the 1920 Constitution was the state's response to the indigenista movement. This movement was led by cultural and socialist political figures who envisioned the indigenous peoples as the inheritors of a reciprocity based communal heritage.⁴ Starn (1992, 1994) and Urrutia (1992) decry a tendency on the part of foreign researchers to perpetuate this view, framing it as essentialist and orientalist-style andeanism. However, Adams' study of Muquiyauyo,⁵ published in 1959, had much earlier called attention to dynamic change in communal forms and configurations due to historical circumstances, including participation in a regional capitalist system. In a re-examination of the same community, Grondin (1978) turned the focus from what had changed to what had remained the same, in terms of how apparent reciprocity hid "calculated exploitation" of indigenous peasants by elites from the Inca Empire on. In his view, the surplus production and labour power of the poor have long been accessed by the powerful through communal mechanisms, for example, to build public works to be enjoyed by the elite and to save the state cost.

Researchers have continued to emphasize the Janus-faced (source of internal mutual support/vehicle for internal and external exploitation) role of the *comunidad*, noting that it is perceived in distinct ways by different actors. Thus, at the time of its 20th-century institution, the *comunidad* was considered both by the government and the applicants to be the "embryo of a new society" (Urrutia 1992:3-4), a tool for development.⁶ For the state, the registration of *comunidades* facilitated access to the peasantry, including to their labour for road building (Davies 1973; Mallon 1983). For their part, peasant communities interested in engaging in the national economy saw registration as a way to do this (Long and Roberts 1978). As I will show, this complex interplay between the contrasting goals of different actors continues in the present.

Collective ownership and administration are central to the legal definition of the *comunidad*. There is an executive elected by *comuneros* (officially registered members). It is territorially based, within which it owns property that is distributed or accessible to *comuneros*. Common land is worked and other resources are built and maintained through communal *faenas* (work bees). Private land ownership is also common within *comunidad* territory but the core of the *comunidad* is a communal peasant agriculture-based territorial polity, based on shared economic and political interests.

The *comunidad* is distinct from the community, which is the larger group of people who identify with a place. I reserve the Spanish term *comunidad* for the political structure and use community to refer to the informal group. The distinction is important, not only because in cases like Allpachico many of those who identify with the place are not *comuneros*, but also because it helps to tease out those elements related to the legal polity from the more informal ways people make claims based on community, or the various other local organizations. While the *comunidad* has been the mainstay local polity, other forms of collective have also been popular. For example, in the Agrarian Reform of 1969, not only was the *comunidad* reinvigorated, reappearing as the *comunidad campesina*, other collective institutions were established in rural areas—cooperatives on coastal sugar plantations, and Social Agrarian Interest Societies in the highlands. Neither of these received much support from the state and most have now vanished. I discuss other examples of local organizing below. Alongside these, while the *comunidad* has not benefited to any great extent from the state, it has retained the interest of the peasantry, and the number of legally recognized *comunidades* has continued to rise (Eguren, del Castillo and Burneo 2009:29).

Now, as the Peruvian state engages with neoliberalism by privatizing its holdings, promoting foreign investment, and launching a policy attack on the *comunidad*, communal organization would appear to be out of favour.⁷ However, to a large extent, the *comunidad*, or at least its collective practice, is simply being reoriented to support this agenda. This reorientation relates to the decentralization of state powers with a growing role for municipalities set within a regional system (for example Allen and Cochrane 2010). In Peru, decentralization of some funds and decisions to municipalities is constructed to allow them to position themselves within regions, and these regions within the larger system, in order better to participate in the market economy. The decentralization law has an objective to support the “self-sustained, competitive economic development of the different regions according to their vocation and productive specialization” and to build the social and economic infrastructure necessary to support investment (Government of Peru 2002:1, my translation). In contrast to many other countries, because the Peruvian state has historically been extremely centralized, decentralization can actually put more resources into rural areas than they have ever had. Certainly, Allpachico has received far more from municipal participatory budgeting than it had ever received from the government before. Municipal funds are bolstered by royalties from resource exploitation in the region. This redistribution, then, entices less-endowed sub regions to support development in well-endowed areas in their larger regions. Further, the marginal sub regions are expected to use their participatory budgeting funding to establish their niche in the system. Thus, municipalities create five-year development plans, which are intended to be harmonized within larger regions, in order to take stock of resources, build infrastructure, and develop a strategy for their economic growth.

There is a long history, then, of attempts by the Peruvian state to support the economy by meddling with local political forms, and by peasants to engage in these to meet their own goals. I now turn to the local level to see how transformations over the past century in a community with few resources have led to a specific pattern of livelihood practices.

The Community and Comunidad of Allpachico

Allpachico is a legal entity, a *comunidad campesina*, with *comuneros* and a defined territory, as well as a more amorphous community of residents and migrants who identify as Allpachiqueños. The territory is located about 300 km east of Lima along the central highway. Relative to

other communities and considering current expectations and markets, it has little land (a little more than 1100 hectares), of which even less is arable or good for pasture, and few other resources. Because of its location and lack of resources, both permanent and temporary out migration for work have been common for at least a century and the resident population fluctuates greatly around an average of about 400 people. Apart from being a *comunidad*, Allpachico is set within Peruvian political space as an annex of the municipal district of Piedra Blanca, a status it has had since the late 19th century. There are some minor productive resources in Piedra Blanca, and the larger region within which it is set is likewise reasonably well off by Peruvian standards, but there is much unevenness. The major engine is the mining sector, including a smelter operation and both large and small mines and rock quarries, along with smaller businesses and commercial agriculture. The labour power from resource poor communities like Allpachico is the major economic link between the different sub regions.

The sale of labour power outside of the community has steadily increased over the past 100 years. This time can be divided into four periods with distinct economic patterns. These periods also yielded various forms of local organization arising or mutating out of the actions of the people, government and NGOs, such as the *comunidad*, kin ties, beneficiary groups for projects, *fiesta* committees and so on.

The first period starts with a settlement of dissident members of a nearby community, Allpagrande. The reasons for the split, which occurred at some time in the mid-19th century, are lost, but it was certainly supported by increasing involvement of the people in the regional economy and political struggles. From about 1900 to 1950, the people grew grain for sale on the local market, alongside subsistence agriculture, and the men worked occasionally in the regional foreign-owned mining sector, using their wages to buy the land and support farming. The American-owned Cerro de Pasco Copper Corporation began mining in the region in 1901 and started operating a smelter in La Oroya, within 80 kilometres of Allpachico in 1922. The men could find work easily in the Corporation or in the English-owned railway that served the mining sector before passing through Allpachico on its way to the agriculturally rich Mantaro Valley. They used income from such work to buy the land from the mother community of Huaripampa in the late 1920s. Most of the land was purchased in common, while individuals purchased arable plots for private use. Some of the communal land was suitable for herding, but most was too rocky for any agricultural use.

At the time of the land purchase, Allpachico's population was augmented by in-migrants with cash who wanted land. In this first period, agriculture was a clear priority. Family ties were important as they were the conduit through which most got access to land, the income to buy land and the labour to work it, as farming was the common goal of all (Vincent 2000). Allpachico applied for and received formal *comunidad* status in the mid-1930s and immediately sought state support to get more land, an appeal that only led to their being allowed to buy a small amount from a neighbouring community. At this time, then, the state-mandated *comunidad* was a mechanism used by the people to facilitate small-scale commercial and subsistence farming by kin groups, a goal crucially supported by temporary wage labour migration.

During the second period, between 1950 and 1980, the focal part of Allpachico's economy gradually shifted to income from long-term male employment in the mines and railway, while small-scale commercial grain farming went in the other direction toward subsistence agriculture. This was an era of great expansion in the foreign owned mining sector (Thorp and Bertam 1978:4). There was much permanent out-migration at this time as many workers and their families found wages and life in the company towns or other urban centres more attractive than peasant farming. Some of these have maintained ties with the community, although many others have lost contact. Family remained strong, although the common interest in farming gave way to diverse livelihood activities that united kin across generations in complementary patterns that joined the stability and cost savings of agricultural produce with access to capital and consumer goods from wages (Vincent 2000). Some migrants invested in agriculture but, as noted, at this time farming was less for market production in favour of providing food for the household and, through gifts, to cement ties with migrants.

Indeed, many migrants took care to maintain a profile in Allpachico by sponsoring fiestas and raising money for projects. Tina, for example, recalls that in 1961, just a couple of weeks after the birth of their first child, she and her husband Jorge were sponsors of the major fiesta. They were living in Ticio at the time, where he was working at the Volcán mine. They had built their house and bought pots, mattresses and so on to host the band and cover all of the costs themselves, without borrowing or receiving help from others. This clearly indicated their commitment to Allpachico and in 1967 Tina moved to the community permanently to farm and care for Jorge's widowed mother. Outside of buying land, which was limited in amount and fertility, return migrants had few options to

invest their earnings in productive enterprises that could engage in wider markets. Several started small shops that generated extremely modest profits. Only two families used Allpachico as a basis for more ambitious ventures: one built up a herd of about 200 sheep in a small commercial operation, and the other exploited a nearby mine.

Associated with male work in the mining sector was the organization of women by company social workers in "housewifization" programs described by De Wind (1975). While teaching North American style home economics, these programs also created associations that the women could use to protest the low wages their husbands received that prohibited a North American lifestyle. They carried these associations in the form of a women's/religious committee back to Allpachico to pursue various religious, community charity and other goals. They might gather clothes to give a poor family, for instance. This committee still exists.

Despite the new forms of livelihood, resident Allpachiqueños did not lose interest in the *comunidad*. Indeed, legal status was considered important enough that one of Allpachico's hamlets, Colibrí, unsuccessfully applied to be a separate *comunidad*. They recognized that the seat of local access to the state political and legal system held substantial power. Throughout these first two periods, the *comunidad* initiated and sponsored its own projects, such as building a church and a school in the 1930s, building a public water system in the 1960s, and organizing production on communal fields. All of this was carried out through *faenas* using *comunero* labour and with the help of money and inputs donated by migrants. Importantly, Allpachico was also the site of a meeting of the Peruvian Peasant Confederation in the mid 1970s, an umbrella group of *comunidades* that challenged government in defence of peasant interests, although by that time it had lost much of its strength.

The third period, in the 1980s, was characterized by economic and political crisis. Hyperinflation meant that migrant men's wage income was quickly worthless and there were frequent strikes. Informal sellers had to be very careful and quick to ensure to profits. Social relations became brittle, although all claimed to be fulfilling their social obligations to others, even while they schemed to cut those ties that threatened the ability to achieve livelihood. The possibility of violence at the hands of either the guerrillas or the military meant that few wanted to take on *comunidad* leadership and the political activism of the 1970s largely evaporated. Despite the diminishment of the political role of the *comunidad*, those migrants who returned to escape the precariousness of life elsewhere⁸ became *comuneros* on their arrival. Most development

possibilities ran through the comunidad and this was the last time that farming was the focus of a major development project. As a result, there was a major overlap among the community, the comunidad and the migrant group. Returnees took advantage of the produce from communal fields in addition to that of their own land, but they also kept an eye on the opportunities available elsewhere.

It is the fourth period that is the focus of this paper. Since 1990, Peru has joined the global neoliberal turn, which has involved privatization of public sector resources, including the mines that Allpachiqueño men used to work in. The decentralization of government put in place since 2000, has entailed regionalization supported by participatory municipal budgeting as its centrepiece. In Allpachico the economy has stabilized into a mix of declining subsistence agriculture, retired workers on pension, and younger households with income from poorly paid male work in nearby rock quarries, which produce marble for international markets. These workers earn much less under much poorer conditions than those of their fathers' generation. No one from Allpachico now works for the privatized mines or smelter. As a result, migrant workers tend to live farther away and have fewer opportunities to visit. Many still make the effort, though, especially for fiestas.

My 2007 survey of 66 resident households in Allpachico indicates that about 45 per cent of them have agriculture as their major source of income; 12 per cent were engaged in non-agricultural informal or temporary work; 21 per cent received wages, usually supplemented by minor agricultural production for home consumption; and another 21 per cent depended on pension income, again usually with a little farming for the table (Vincent in press).⁹ The herding family is still active in Allpachico, while the mine-owning family has a declining presence there. Out-migration has continued, now tending toward Lima rather than to the regional mining centres and some Allpachiqueños have professional employment or businesses there or in the regional city of Huancayo. Many others engage in the informal sector or other work that does not require formal qualifications with a range of income and stability. Several of the migrants from the earlier period have returned to Allpachico with pensions to live in familiar, low-cost surroundings where they can grow a bit of good quality food. Interestingly, there is also some in-migration of farming families from communities farther from main roads, who bolster the ranks of the comuneros. In contrast to the earlier set of in-migrants who bought land, these want better access to schools and markets. Over the time covered by the four periods I have

recounted here, Allpachico has gone from a farming community buttressed by migrant income, to a combination of farming and remittances from migrant labour, and now to farming, remittances, low local wages and pensions, with new resources from government programs.

So far, I have described the formation of different groups in Allpachico around the changing Peruvian economy. Now I focus on the new forms of collectives that have been instituted in the community. There has been a rise in non-comunidad associations with the comunidad playing an important but often unacknowledged role. For example, in the 1990s, there was a proliferation of collectivities that incorporated work for welfare with development goals, such as empowering women or relieving poverty. Elsewhere such programs were associated with neoliberal rationalizing and reducing of state welfare programs (for example Peck and Theodore 2001). The same was true in Peru, although this entailed the transformation of universal programs into targeted programs for the poor in President Fujimori's clientelistic government, thus sometimes putting more resources into the hands of specific groups, such as women (Roberts 1995). The recipients typically performed some service work for this welfare (please see Rousseau 2006; see Gill 2000 on Bolivia). For example, mothers (and, for a time, one father) of children under the age of seven in the *Vaso de Leche*¹⁰ (Glass of Milk) program receive monthly food supplements from the municipal government. They meet each month to receive the food and to carry out service in exchange, such as cleaning the plaza before fiestas. They must also march in parades or participate in soccer tournaments when the mayor requests this. The current hand-out consists of four tins of evaporated milk and 800 grams of rolled oats per child—worth a bit less than a day's wage for an agricultural worker and thus of particular interest to the poor. The Vaso de Leche program is the only such one left now, and people much lament the lack. Although these women's groups bear some resemblance to the women's committee that was established in the second period, their membership differentiates it from the latter which is largely composed of wealthier wives of returned migrants, and who perform religious and charitable work. Further, consistent with the new framing of other local organizations, Vaso de Leche instils the principle of performing public service, using comunidad buildings and resources, as a way to get needed benefits.

Migrants maintain their connections to Allpachico in a variety of ways, among them through fiestas, which I examine in some detail below. Many migrants still wish to access agricultural produce from Allpachico, either to save expenses or to enjoy superior food to what they can

buy. Leaving land to be sharecropped or livestock to be herded creates direct ties between migrants and comuneros, depending in an indirect way on the comunidad. The comunidad organizes annual vaccinations and sheep baths for parasites, along with various other supports for agriculture. Livestock is herded on comunidad-owned pasture to which comuneros (registered members) have access. Thus, comunero herders use their access to comunidad resources to offer their services to migrant kin and others.

Kin ties continue to provide a latent network that can be activated on different occasions or over a period of time. I have already noted the rise of kinship based on complementary livelihood activities, over the earlier common farming pattern, highlighting the inclusion of residents and migrants in the network. Given the difficulty for Allpachico-based households to find jobs that pay well now, compared to in the second period, retired men with pensions are having to help out their children well into adulthood. Thus, the ties between generations remain strong, but the balance of aid between them has shifted as the same aging generation of men continues to have the most stable income. Pensioners in Allpachico may assist children living elsewhere with both agricultural produce and money, in contrast to the second period when the same men sent remittances to their farming kin who sent them food. Kinship is a fluid relationship in this area, though, going far beyond the nuclear family. It can be activated when needed among more distant relatives as well as with those related through fictive ties, such as god parenthood. Migrants and resident non-comuneros can find out what decisions are being debated in the comunidad through their comunero kin, and migrants enjoy comunidad-instigated services when they visit. It is significant that one of the reasons comuneros gave for seeking a sewerage system project was to make visits to Allpachico more comfortable for their migrant kin.

Although the comunidad continues to play a crucial role in both residential and agricultural services, membership is in decline.¹¹ This trend coincides with the tendency in this fourth period for local development projects to bypass the comunidad formally, while relying heavily on it: projects are debated in comunidad assemblies, take advantage of comunidad equipment and resources, require comunidad leaders to spend time in meetings and negotiations, and use information and communication mechanisms set up by the comunidad. Comunidad leaders must thus take on responsibility for representing the community as a whole. It has been a matter of great frustration for comuneros that more return migrants with pensions have not taken on leadership roles, which can

be onerous, costly, have few benefits and receive much criticism.

They may not always get much credit, either, as despite the key role of the comunidad, these projects have entailed the formation of separate groups to build, maintain, and or manage the service. The earlier electrification and water systems were carried out by foreign NGOs in this way, and since 2004 the same has happened with projects supported by municipal participatory budgeting. This program has been a hallmark of regionalization in the Peruvian neoliberal era. Elsewhere (Vincent 2010), I have described the participatory budgeting process in more detail. In brief, public funds are allocated to projects that are presented and prioritized in workshops by representatives of eligible civil society groups. In fact, though, in Allpachico only the comunidad sends a representative who is expected to act for all the community. This is so despite the fact that membership in the service user groups can outnumber the comunidad: for example, there are 58 households in the water/sewerage collective and only 36 in the comunidad. Although in principle all of those who benefit from a project must contribute labour to it, in fact, a disproportionate amount of the work is carried out by comuneros, whether in their role as members of the comunidad or because they also tend to be those who cannot pay fines for non-attendance. They consider this exploitative and unfair (Vincent 2005). Thus, unpaid community labour is put to work in Peru's political decentralization process.

For their part, migrants and returned migrants consider themselves to be part of the community (although almost never are they comuneros), and frequently use their contributions to fiestas to support claims to services. For example, in 2003 a man (unsuccessfully) requested that fines for missed faenas on the water project be forgiven since he was doing his part for the community by being a fiesta sponsor that year. His lack of success reflects the friction between those who do the actual work and those who pay fines, sponsor fiestas or give to the community in other ways. Fierce debates arise over return migrants who wish to connect their houses in Allpachico to the water or sewerage grids. When they ask to do so, they are appalled at the cost, which is equivalent to the sum of the fines for missed faenas multiplied by the rate of inflation. For reasons I have discussed elsewhere (Vincent 2005), there was a high number of faenas in the water project and so the connection cost is very expensive—more than it would be in a city.

In spite of the central role of the comunidad and of comuneros, the projects they have requested in participatory budgeting workshops have related to quality of life

and residential service infrastructure, appealing particularly to returned migrants, rather than to agriculture, the supposed economic basis of the comunidad. The situation is complex since comunidades have always fulfilled both residential service and economic support roles, but it is significant that the unprecedented state funds made available to Allpachico in municipal participatory budgeting, in which the representative of the community is a comunero, ends up being spent on residential services, rather than on improvements to farming. Thus, although they may appear to be peasant proposals, they actually represent a far more complex compromise between farmers, non-farming residents, and migrants, based on their mutual needs and their conflicting positions.¹² This compromise is enforced by the wider political economy, which offers few incentives to farmers and little security to workers. Further, insofar as sewerage, health posts and schools (the major projects so far) support the reproduction of the regional work force, the unpaid community labour embedded in them can be seen to sustain low wages for the capitalist sector.

In this section I have presented the historical development of differently positioned groups, broadly identifiable as migrants, pensioners and comunero farmers. Complex ties bind and also lead to tensions between these groups. For example, in the current neoliberal state restructuring, participatory budgeting resources seem to cater to the first two groups, while depending on the third for completion. The attachments and conflicts among these groups are illustrated in a recent fiesta, to which I now turn. The events show how the divergent interests among Allpachiqueños, as well as between them and the state, can converge.

A Community Fiesta

Fiestas are important events in Allpachico, providing a way to examine the alliances and conflicts among the various collectivities as they meet in the place where they earn a living, from which they derive identity, or where they may wish to return to enjoy a tranquil, low-cost retirement or to mitigate a personal or household economic crisis. I have presented these different groups above, and now build on that history to analyse current tensions and compromises. The 2011 pre-Easter fiesta was a *corta monte* fiesta.¹³ The central part of the fiesta involves trees, which have been cut down and brought to a public square or park where they are decorated and erected. Couples dance to the music of a band around them, taking turns with an axe to cut them down. The last couple to chop at the tree before it falls must sponsor a tree in the fiesta the following year. The sponsors

are responsible for buying the tree, arranging for it to be set up, decorating it and passing the axe from dancing couple to dancing couple. Decorations can be as simple as coloured paper streamers, or may include dishes, toys and blankets. While tree sponsors are the most important, others may also volunteer to set up games such as pulling ribbons or breaking pottery dishes. The ribbons and dishes contain notes that indicate what the person must contribute for the following year, such as a case of beer. Women dress in festive costume, which they either own or rent by the day from an ambulant business that sets up for the purpose. Men wear business suits. The fiesta is run by a committee, which is elected at the previous year's fiesta for the following year. The committee has the obligation of raising money to pay for the band and related expenses, identifying people to provide food and lodging to the band, arranging a trip to a shrine 20 kilometres away, keeping track of the sponsors of the trees, and generally organizing the event.

The role individuals have in the fiesta tends to be related to their socio-economic position and gender. Migrants take centre stage, usually forming the core of the organizing committee and the majority of those who dance in costume. Only those with adequate income can afford the costs involved, and participating in these ways constitutes a claim to status. Many can share in this claim as, in contrast to Tina and Jorge 50 years ago, current fiesta sponsors may get contributions from many donors. Further, the claim is different from that made by Tina and Jorge five decades earlier: Tina and Jorge were preparing to live and farm in Allpachico, while current sponsors' goals are more contingent. They can feel important in ways that may not be available to them where they live and work. Further, they can demonstrate their religious devotion, and connect with family and friends. Migrants with land that is sharecropped, or with livestock that is herded in the community can check on their property and herders may take advantage of their presence to hold a *herranza*, a ritual celebration in which livestock are marked with paint to indicate ownership and counted. There is much discussion of the difficulties of life in Lima and other cities where migrants live, especially of the danger of robbery, the pollution, and the poor quality of food. That the fiesta is important to migrants is evident not only in their contributions but also in the extraordinary efforts many take to attend: those living in Lima might travel overnight to spend one day at the fiesta and return to Lima in time for work the following day.

The migrants are enthusiastically greeted by their families and other residents. Family networks are revived as the visitors often stay and eat with their

Allpachico-based kin, so that host family women spend much of the time cooking. The residents watch carefully to see who has come and there is much catching up on news about who is where and what they are doing. In particular, un- and underemployed Allpachiqueños want to find out where there might be a job or other income-earning possibility.

Lower in the hierarchy than the sponsors and costumed dancers are those who dance on the edges of the area and do not line up to chop at the trees. More marginal still are those who watch from the side, again differentiated among those who sit on the grass and those who can beg a chair from someone who lives nearby or who is running a food or drink stall. The in-migrants from more isolated communities do not tend to do more than watch Allpachico's fiesta, although they may sponsor similar ones in their community of origin. Especially for poor residents and shopkeepers, but also for some returnees, fiestas are money-making opportunities from the sale of beer, other drinks and food. The Vaso de Leche women clean the plaza beforehand, and other groups like the school parents association might sell barbecued meat to raise funds for the school. All comment on the quality of the music and dancing and compare the decorations on the trees.

In their different ways, all find the fiesta highly entertaining, but there are also tensions. In 2011 a conflict arose over where fiesta was held. While in previous years some of the trees had been set up in the *barrio* (neighbourhood) on the down-river side of the village, this year all of them were set up by the sports field above the plaza. The issue was raised at the business meeting of the fiesta, held to elect the committee for the following year. Rosa charged that the lower barrio had been marginalized and demanded to know the reason. Rosa's mother migrated away from Allpachico decades ago but the family has maintained frequent contact with relatives, the Estradas, who still live there. Rosa has been active in sponsoring this and other fiestas in Allpachico, as have other members of the extended family. Discussions among the Estradas suggested that another family, the Chancas, was monopolizing the fiesta and holding it at a place more convenient for them. Rosa said that she was to have been a sponsor of one of the trees, but that she had not received a letter from the organizing committee to acknowledge this and let her know what the plans were for this year. As a result, she did not present a tree at all.

The Chancas were certainly evident in the fiesta organization and the president of the organizing committee was a member of that family, a migrant who lived in Lima. While most of the members of the organizing

committee were migrants, the secretary was from Allpachico. Yolanda was married to a Chanca, who worked in one of the rock quarries. She had entered politics and after serving a term as municipal councillor, had just been elected councillor at the higher provincial level. As councillor, Yolanda receives a stipend, an important addition to her income.¹⁴ It was Yolanda's job as secretary to write the letters to sponsors, so she responded to Rosa's complaint at the meeting. Yolanda excused herself, explaining that no slight had been intended. She had not known who all of the sponsors were nor how to get in touch with them, so some had not received letters.

This inter-family conflict thus adds another dimension to the tensions that persist between migrants, pensioners and farmers, but like the other tensions, it was ultimately muted. As it happens, Luis, a member of the Estrada family, had replaced Yolanda as municipal councillor. In the discussions about the conflict, Rafael, one of the male Estrada migrants, urged him to push for a plaza and other improvements to the lower barrio. Rafael promised to get support from other migrants for these projects. A couple of months later, Luis spearheaded an initiative to designate the community a *centro poblado menor* (small population centre). This is a kind of junior municipal status that would create a local elected government structure that would be separate from the *comunidad*, and that would be able to carry out some municipal functions, such as issuing birth certificates and marriage licences. Most importantly, it would be able to administer its own share of municipal budgeting funds. To achieve this status, Allpachico must present 2500 names of possible residents—over six times the current population of Allpachico. This will require a massive effort to locate migrants from several generations. The interactions at upcoming fiestas will no doubt lead to many of these names.

This conflict and its outcome are interesting in that the expressed tension was largely between different groups of migrants, but it is very closely related to the tensions between residents and migrants discussed above. The latter tensions are still evident as, although they may take a back seat during the fiesta, resident *comuneros* are aware of how they provide the backdrop to the display put on by migrants and wealthy residents. For example, the cement sports field where the *corta monte* fiesta was held in 2011 and the plaza where most fiestas are held have both received improvements over the past decade, funded by the municipality, and planning and work for both were mediated through the *comunidad*.

The point of this vignette, however, is not only to point out fault lines, but to observe how these are bridged.

Allpachico remains important as both an instrumental and affective community locus for all groups. Migrants derive identity, along with gift exchanges and the possibility of future residence through maintaining ties to villagers, while residents get access to the resources that their wage-earning contacts can provide, as well as entertainment and an affirmation of the value of their community. Given the crucial complementarity between villagers and migrants, conflicts between these groups are expressed at the risk of dangerous repercussions. Conflicts between migrants, as happened here, arise when the “siloeed” connections link a migrant to a resident, and not to other migrants. The tie that can bind them all, providing ongoing future resources to comuneros and the basis for continued relations among all these groups, has been offered by the neoliberal state, in the form of the centro poblado menor status. Seen from the perspective of the comunidad, interestingly, this designation is more about defending a sense of community than it is about supporting state interests.

Conclusion

Peru's current economic boom has led to major investments in mines in highly specific regions, with spin-off benefits for some of the communities there, but the overall pattern of growth has been highly uneven. The region in which Allpachico is located has some resources of interest to global markets, but production costs must be kept low for them to be viable. Labour is a key element here. The economic history I have presented shows the development of Allpachico as a producer of labour power rather than of goods, with the coalescence of different groups based on how they relate to the national wage market. The senses of kinship, comunidad and community have changed alongside the transformations in these groups. We can see the result in the effect of the current Peruvian decentralization process, with its municipal participatory budgeting system, which shows up in a chain of labour exchanges. Thus, communal practices with comunero labour produce living conditions at low cost, helping to produce cheap migrant workers' labour, by producing people who leave to find work, by sending food to reproduce migrants and by providing affordable residence to pensioners.¹⁵

While that lens highlights exploitation by capital, leeching from the comunidad through workers to their employers, comuneros and other poor residents have also engaged with this system to meet their own ends. These ends are both instrumental and affective. Environmental and current marketing conditions make farming more suitable for subsistence or reciprocal exchange with kin

than for sale. In turn, gifts of produce are both valuable, in saving the migrants money and values-laden, in the significance of homegrown food. If Allpachiqueños have used municipal participatory budgeting funds to create a place, which migrant kin and friends will want to visit and perhaps live, this makes sense in terms of maintaining the meaning of livelihoods, as well as of lifeways, including fiestas.

The situation is not without conflict: there is resentment between those who contribute their labour to public works and those who try to access service without working, although the claims of kinship and mutual dependence counteract this. Further, the fact that different groups of migrants confront one another over the right to claim a place in Allpachico, shows the ongoing importance of being Allpachiqueño. In this way, while local level organization in the current era can be seen to be part of a neoliberal turn, Allpachiqueños are also using the new resources to sustain their own dynamic sense of community.

Susan Vincent, Department of Anthropology, St. Francis Xavier University, P.O. Box 5000, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, B2G 2W5. E-mail: svincent@stfx.ca.

Acknowledgments

Gavin Smith's comments on an early draft of this paper helped guide it in a much more fruitful direction. I also gratefully acknowledge the insightful comments of Naomi McPherson and two anonymous reviewers who helped sharpen its argument. The paper's weaknesses are all my own. The 2011 fieldwork on which this paper is based was self-funded, but builds on earlier work supported by SSHRC, the *Consorcio de Investigación Económica y Social*, and a St. Francis Xavier University Council for Research grant.

Notes

- 1 For critical analyses of communitarianism, see Baumann 1996, 1998a, 1998b, 2000; Fraser 2005; Kymlicka 2007; Rose 1999. On development, see Cooke and Kothari 2001; Guijt and Shah 1998; Hickey and Mohan 2004; Mosse 2006; Pieterse 1998).
- 2 “Allpachico,” “Piedra Blanca,” and all names of people are pseudonyms. I began doing fieldwork in Allpachico in 1984 and have returned frequently since then. My major methodology has been participant observation, supplemented by interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, censuses of the community, archival research and photography. This paper focuses on fieldwork undertaken in 2011, which was self-funded.
- 3 For a history of the complexities and contradictions of neoliberal processes, see Harvey (2005).

- 4 Pribilsky (2010) notes that the cultural elements tended to win out over the socialist ones in the following decades.
- 5 Muquiyauyo was lauded by the indigenista writers of the early part of the twentieth century as a progressive communal model when they lobbied for legal recognition of indigenous communities. Adams emphasizes Muquiyauyo's communal character, but argues that it was a new transformation linked to local power struggles and the townspeople's engagement with the wider mining and industrializing capitalist economy. Thus, a *mestizo* elite successfully established Muquiyauyo as a municipal district in the War of the Pacific in the late 19th century, achieving autonomy from the neighbouring town of Huaripampa. The War of the Pacific had not only pitted Peru against Chile, but also saw a division between a Lima-based elite leaning toward surrender against a nationalist elite that wished to continue resistance against the Chilean invaders (Mallon 1983). The nationalist faction (which won the nation but not the war) offered municipal status as a reward for communities that engaged in actions against the Chileans. Allpachico was also an annex of Huaripampa until another town, Piedra Blanca, received municipal status in the same period and for the same reasons as Muquiyauyo.
- 6 See Mossbrucker (1990) and Urrutia (1992) for reviews of the large literature on the Peruvian *comunidad campesina*.
- 7 President Alan García's 2007 speech denouncing the *perro del hortelano* syndrome is a case in point (García 2007). In the mid 1990s, in a representation to Congress, which was considering proposals to facilitate the dismantling of *comunidades*, famed anthropologist Enrique Mayer (1996) defended the institution as a flexible and pragmatic structure and as an effective way to ensure the ecological sustainability of farmland.
- 8 Bourdieu (1998:95-101) notes that *La précarité est aujourd'hui partout* but the enormity of the crisis at that time and the relative stability shows a somewhat different view for the Peruvian peasantry. Still, severe poverty and inequality persist and migrant Allpachiqueños continue to rely on returning to the community to get through various crises.
- 9 This information was gathered from a key informant and is based on residents in three of the four hamlets in Allpachico. There is likely a slight bias toward agricultural activities since two of these hamlets are solely agricultural (although they have small populations), while the hamlet that was not included is more mixed. The 66 households are about three-quarters of the total. The high degree of mobility of the people makes accurate statistics impossible. The percentages do not add up to 100 due to rounding.
- 10 Note that the Vaso de Leche program was initiated by the socialist mayor of Lima, Alfonso Barrantes, in 1984 (Jelin and Pereyra 1990). Scaled up to the national level, it coincided with Fujimori's goals.
- 11 Further, there is little confidence on the part of residents in the authorities who have been elected and a general feeling that people only run for office to be able to skim off the income generated by rental of the *comunidad tractor* or other resources.
- 12 In a recent article, John Cameron (2009) discusses how peasant organizations in Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador have become active in municipal politics. This situation may be more complicated, given what I have argued here about the skewing of the *comunidad* to represent non-peasant interests.
- 13 See Laite and Long (1987) for a fascinating account of the expressions of *corta monte fiestas* in three locations in the central highlands, linking them to uneven capitalist expansion.
- 14 Degregori and Meléndez (2007) and Meléndez (2005) observe the rise of "electoral entrepreneurs"—people who enter politics for personal benefit. While I do not charge Yolanda and Luis (below) with being electoral entrepreneurs, the income was important to both.
- 15 Binford (2003) describes a similar situation in Mexico, in his contribution to a debate about whether migrant remittances support development in their communities of origin. He rejects this, arguing that labour producing areas tend to continue as such, rather than becoming centres of independent production, while migrant income supports larger scale capitalists in receiving countries as well as in Mexico.

References

- Adams, Richard
1959 A Community in the Andes: Problems and Progress in Muquiyauyo. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Allen, John, and Allan Cochrane
2010 Assemblages of State Power: Topological Shifts in the Organization of Government and Politics. *Antipode* 42(5):1071-1089.
- Amit, Vered
2010 Community as "Good to Think With": The Productiveness of Strategic Ambiguities. *Anthropologica* 52(2):357-363.
- Bauman, Zygmunt
1996 On Communitarians and Human Freedom: Or, How to Square the Circle. *Theory, Culture & Society* 13(2):79-90.
1998a Globalization: The Human Consequences. New York: Columbia University Press.
1998b On Glocalization or Globalization for Some, Localization for Some Others. *Thesis Eleven* 54(1):37-49.
2000 Liquid Modernity. London: Polity.
- Bebbington, A., and T. Perreault
1999 Social Capital, Development, and Access to Resources in Highland Ecuador. *Economic Geography* 75(4):395-418.
- Binford, Leigh
2003 Migrant Remittances and (Under)Development. *Critique of Anthropology* 23(3):305-336.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1998 Contre-feux. Paris: Liber.
- Brenner, Neil
2004 New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, John D.
2009 Hacia La Alcaldía: The Municipalization of Peasant Politics in the Andes. *Latin American Perspectives* 36(4):64-82.

- Chambers, Robert
 1983 *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. London: Longman.
 2008 *Revolutions in Development Inquiry*. London: Earthscan.
- Cooke, Bill, and Uma Kothari, eds.
 2001 *Participation: The New Tyranny*. London: Zed.
- Cowen, M.P., and R.W. Shenton
 1996 *Doctrines of Development*. London: Routledge.
- Davies, Thomas
 1973 Indian Integration in Peru, 1820-1948: An Overview. *The Americas* 30(2):184-208.
- Degregori, Carlos Iván, and Carlos Meléndez
 2007 *El Nacimiento de los Otorongos: El Congreso Durante los Gobiernos de Alberto Fujimori (1990-2000)*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- De Wind, Adrian
 1975 From Peasants to Miners: The Background to Strikes in the Mines of Peru. *Science and Society* 39(1): 44-72.
- Eguren, Fernando, Laureano del Castillo, and Zulema Burneo
 2009 Los Derechos de Propiedad Sobre la Tierra en las Comunidades Campesinas. *Economía y Sociedad* 71:29-38.
- Escobar, Arturo
 1997 Anthropology and Development. *International Social Science Journal* 49(4):497-515.
- Etzioni, Amitai
 1996 A Moderate Communitarian Proposal. *Political Theory* 24(2):155-171.
- Fraser, Nancy
 2005 Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review* 36:69-88.
- Friedman, Jonathan
 1999 Class Formation, Hybridity, and Ethnification in Declining Global Hegemonies. *In Globalisation and the Asia Pacific: Contested Territories*. K. Olds, P. Dicken, P.F. Kelly, L. Kong, and H. Yeung, eds. Pp. 183-201. London and New York: Routledge.
- Friedman, Jonathan
 2002 From Roots to Routes: Tropes for Trippers. *Anthropological Theory* 2(1): 21-36.
- García, Alan
 2007 El Síndrome Del Perro del Hortelano. *El Comercio*, 28 October, http://elcomercio.pe/edicionimpresa/html/2007-10-28/el_sindrome_del_perro_del_hortelano.html, accessed 3 August 2011.
- Gill, Lesley
 2000 *Teetering on the Rim: Global Restructuring, Daily Life, and the Armed Retreat of the Bolivian State*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Government of Peru
 2002 LEY N° 27783 Ley de Bases de la Descentralización. <http://www.congreso.gob.pe/ntley/Imagenes/Leyes/27783.pdf>, accessed September 4, 2012.
- Grondin, Marcelo
 1978 *Comunidad Andina: Explotación Calculada*. Santo Domingo: Unidad de Divulgación Técnica de la Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura de la República Dominicana.
- Guijt, I., and M. K. Shah, eds.
 1998 *The Myth of Community: Gender Issues in Participatory Development*. London: IT.
- Harvey, David
 1989 From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografika Annaler, Series B* 71(1): 3-17.
 1995 Globalization in Question. *Rethinking Marxism* 8(4):1-17.
 2005 *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hickey, Sam, and Giles Mohan, eds.
 2004 *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?* London: Zed.
- Jelin, Elizabeth, and Brenda Pereyra
 1990 Caring and Coping: Households, Communities and Public Services in the Making of Women's Daily Lives. Buenos Aires: CEDES, #35. http://www.cedes.org.ar/Publicaciones/Doc_c/Doc_c35.pdf, accessed January 14, 2010.
- Jessop, Bob
 2002 *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Khan, Akhter Hameed
 1997 The Orangi Pilot Project: Uplifting a Periurban Settlement near Karachi, Pakistan. *In Reasons for Hope: Instructive Experiences in Rural Development*. A. Krishna, N. Uphoff, and M. Esman, eds. Pp. 25-40. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Kymlicka, Will
 2007 Multicultural Odysseys. *Ethnopolitics*. 6(4):585-597.
- Laite, Julian, and Norman Long
 1987 Fiestas and Uneven Capitalist Development in Central Peru. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 6(1):27-53.
- Long, Norman, and Bryan Roberts, eds.
 1978 *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Maclean, Kate
 2010 Capitalizing on Women's Social Capital? Women-Targeted Microfinance in Bolivia. *Development and Change* 41(3):495-515.
- Mallon, Florencia E.
 1983 *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mathie, Alison, and Gordon Cunningham, eds.
 2008 *From Clients to Citizens: Communities Changing the Course of Their Own Development*. Warwickshire, UK: Practical Action Publications.
- Mayer, Enrique
 1996 Propiedad Comunal y Desarrollo. http://www.andes.missouri.edu/andes/especiales/em_congreso.html, accessed June 22, 1999.
- Meléndez, Carlos
 2005 Mediaciones y Conflictos: Las Transformaciones de la Intermediación Política y los Estallidos de Violencia en el Perú Actual. *In El Estado Está de Vuelta: Desigualdad, Diversidad y Democracia*. Victor Vich, ed. Pp.159-183. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

- Mossbrucker, Harald
 1990 *La Economía Campesina y el Concepto "Comunidad": un Enfoque Crítico*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Mosse, David
 2006 *Collective Action, Common Property, and Social Capital in South India: An Anthropological Commentary*. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 54(3):695-724.
- Narotzky, Susana, and Gavin Smith
 2006 *Immediate Struggles: People, Power and Place in Rural Spain*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parpart, Jane, Shirin Rao, and Kathleen Staudt, eds.
 2002 *Rethinking Empowerment: Gender and Development in a Global/Local World*. London: Routledge.
- Peck, Jamie, and Nik Theodore
 2001 *Exporting Workfare/Importing Welfare-to-Work: Exploring the Politics of Third Way Policy Transfer*. *Political Geography* 20(4):427-460.
- Pieterse, J. Nederveen
 1998 *My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development*. *Development and Change* 29:343-373.
- Pribilsky, Jason
 2010 *El Desarrollo y el "Problema Indígena" en los Andes Durante la Guerra Fría: Indigenismo, Ciencia y Modernización en el Proyecto Perú*. Cornell en Vicos. *In 50 Años de Antropología Aplicada en el Perú: Vicos y Otras Experiencias*. Ralph Bolton, Tom Greaves, and Florencia Zapata eds. Pp. 153-192. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Roberts, Kenneth M.
 1995 *Neoliberalism and the Transformation of Populism: The Peruvian Case*. *World Politics* 48(1):82-116.
- Rose, Nikolas
 1999 *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rousseau, Stephanie
 2006 *Women's Citizenship and Neopopulism: Peru under the Fujimori Regime*. *Latin American Politics and Society* 48(1): 117-142.
- Sassen, Saskia
 2008 *Neither Global nor National: Novel Assemblages of Territory, Authority and Rights*. *Ethics and Global Politics* 1(1-2). DOI: 10.3402/egp.v1i1.1814.
- Starn, Orin
 1992 *Antropología Andina, "Andinismo" y Sendero Luminoso*. *Allpachis* 39:15-71.
- Starn, Orin
 1994 *Rethinking the Politics of Anthropology: The Case of the Andes*. *Current Anthropology* 35:13-38.
- Thorp, Rosemary, and Geoffrey Bertram
 1978 *Peru, 1890-1977: Growth and Policy in an Open Economy*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Turner, Mark
 1995 *"Republicanos" and "La Comunidad de Peruanos": Unimagined Political Communities in Postcolonial Andean Peru*. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 27(2):291-318.
- Urrutia, Jaime
 1992 *Comunidades Campesinas y Antropología: Historia de un Amor (Casi) Eterno*. *Debate Agrario* 14:1-16.
- Vincent, Susan
 2000 *Flexible Families: Capitalist Development and Crisis in Rural Peru*. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 31(2): 155-170.
 2005 *Cooperación Internacional, Desarrollo y Comunidades Campesinas: ¿De Asistencialismo Al Libre Mercado?* Documento de Trabajo 145. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
 2010 *Participatory Budgeting in Peru: Democratization, State Control or Community Autonomy?* *focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 56:65-77.
 In press *Dimensions of Development: History, Community and Change in Allpachico, Peru*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Woolcock, Michael, and Deepa Narayan
 2000 *Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research and Policy*. *World Bank Research Observer* 15:225-249.